arXiv:1211.0967v1 [math.LO] 5 Nov 2012

Bisimilarity is not Borel

Pedro Sánchez Terraf*

Abstract

We prove that the relation of bisimilarity between countable labelled transition systems is not Borel, by reducing bounded classes of countable wellorders continuously to it.

This has an impact on the theory of probabilistic and nondeterministic processes over uncountable spaces, since the proofs of logical characterizations of bisimilarity based on the unique structure theorem for analytic spaces require a countable logic whose formulas have measurable semantics. Our reduction shows that such a logic does not exist in the case of image-infinite process.

1 Introduction

Markov decision processes over continuous state-space are an appropriate framework to study and formalize systems that involve continuously valued variables such as those arising in physics, biology, and economics; and where some of those variables are known only in a probabilistic way.

In this direction, *labelled Markov processes (LMP)* where developed in [5, 6] by Desharnais et alter. An LMP has a labelled set of *actions* that encode interaction with the environment; thus LMP are a reactive model in which there are different transition subprobabilities for each action. In this model, uncertainty is (only) considered to be probabilistic; therefore, LMP can be regarded as generalization of *deterministic* processes.

Models that include both probabilism and internal nondeterminism arise naturally, e.g., by abstraction of LMP. In the discrete case, *probabilistic automata* are an example. Over uncountable state spaces, the common generalization of LMP and probabilistic automata are *nondeterministic labelled Markov processes (NLMP)* [3, 14]. NLMP allow, for each state and each action, a (possibly infinite) set of probabilistic behaviors. A different approach, using super-additive functions, is proposed in [7].

In [3, 4] the problem of defining appropriate notions of bisimulation and finding logical characterizations for NLMP was addressed. It turns out that there are three different notions of bisimilarity: traditional, state-based and event-based. Two of these notions

---

*The author was partially supported by CONICET, SECYT-UNC and the MEALS Project (`http://meals-project.eu/`). Part of this work was presented at Dagstuhl Seminar 12411 on *Coalgebraic Logics.*

Keywords: measurable labelled transition system, non-deterministic labelled Markov process, modal logic, Borel hierarchy. *MSC 2010:* 03B70; 03E15; 28A05. *ACM class:* F.4.1; F.1.2.

collapse to the state bisimilarity when one drops non-determinism (i.e., for LMP), and the third one is analogous to the concept for LMP bearing the same name. Furthermore, when the state-space is analytic, state-based and event-based bisimilarity coincide for LMP [2]. This was proved alternatively, over Polish spaces, in Doberkat [8].

In both LMP and NLMP, event bisimilarity is a relation naturally characterized by a modal logic, in the sense that two states satisfy exactly the same formulas if and only if they are bisimilar eventwise. When event and traditional bisimilarities coincides, we speak of a *logical characterization of bisimilarity*, emphasizing the role of traditional (state) bisimilarity as a the most natural generalization of *probabilistic* bisimilarity by Larsen and Skou [11] to NLMP (LMP).

The *unique structure theorem* provides a very clear way to prove the logical characterization of bisimilarity for LMP with an analytic state-space, as in the work of Danos et al. [2]. The argument there can be generalized to encompass image-finite NLMP (i.e., having a finite number of probabilistic behaviors for each pair $\langle$state,action$\rangle$) over analytic state spaces. Actually, a proof strategy can be found in [3, 1]: every countable 'measurable' logic $\mathscr{L}$ satisfying certain local restrictions must characterize bisimilarity. (Here we call a logic *measurable* if the extension of each formula is a measurable subset of the state space.) Both countability and measurability requirements are necessary for the proof to work.

In this paper we show that the relation of bisimilarity is not Borel in an appropriate Polish space, and therefore we prove that there is no countable measurable logic that characterizes it. In the next section we review some of the known results on NLMP, describing the available notions of bisimulation. Most calculations in the paper will be carried on a simpler model also described in Section 2. In Section 3 we use some machinery of sequence spaces and unwinding of labelled transition systems to assess the complexity of the relation of bisimilarity. The final section contains some concluding remarks.

2 Review of NLMP

2.1 Basic definitions

All the material of this section appears in [4]. Let (S, Σ) be a measurable space. The set $\Delta(S)$ of probability measures on (S, Σ) has a natural σ-algebra $\Delta(\Sigma) = \sigma(\{\Delta^{\geq q}(Q) : q \in \mathbb{Q}, Q \in \Sigma\})$, where $\Delta^{\geq q}(Q) = \{\mu \in \Delta(S) : \mu(Q) \geq q\}$. This is the least σ-algebra making evaluation $\mu \mapsto \mu(Q)$ measurable.

Recall that a Markov kernel on (S, Σ) is a measurable map $T : (S, \Sigma) \to (\Delta(S), \Delta(\Sigma))$. The following definitions generalize this concept by enlarging the codomain to the family of all measurable sets of probability measures ($\Delta(\Sigma)$), and construct a σ-algebra for this family in order to be able to say that T is measurable.

Definition 1. $H(\Delta(\Sigma))$ is the least σ-algebra containing all sets $H_\xi \doteq \{\zeta \in \Delta(\Sigma) : \zeta \cap \xi \neq \varnothing\}$ with $\xi \in \Delta(\Sigma)$.

Definition 2. A *nondeterministic labeled Markov process* (NLMP) is a tuple $(S, \Sigma, \{T_a : a \in L\})$ where Σ is a σ-algebra on the set of states S, and for each label $a \in L$, $T_a : S \to \Delta(\Sigma)$ is measurable.

The motivation for the previous definitions is that we want the event "*there exists* a probabilistic behavior from s such that ..." to be measurable; to be able to calculate the probability of such event (cf. the semantics of the logic below).

Some notation concerning binary relations will be needed to define bisimulations. Let R a binary relation over S. A set Q is *R-closed* if $Q \ni x\ R\ y$ implies $y \in Q$. $\Sigma(R)$ is the σ-algebra of R-closed sets in Σ. If μ, μ' are measures defined on Σ, we write $\mu\ R\ \mu'$ if they coincide in $\Sigma(R)$. Lastly, let Ξ be a subset of $\mathsf{Pow}(S)$, the powerset of S. The relation $\mathcal{R}(\Xi)$ is given by:

$$(s,t) \in \mathcal{R}(\Xi) \quad \iff \quad \forall Q \in \Xi : s \in Q \Leftrightarrow t \in Q.$$

Definition 3.

1. An *event bisimulation* on a NLMP $(S, \Sigma, \{T_a : a \in L\})$ is a sub-σ-algebra Λ of Σ such that $T_a : (S, \Lambda) \to (\Delta(\Sigma), H(\Delta(\Lambda)))$ is measurable for each $a \in L$. We also say that a relation R is an event bisimulation if there is an event bisimulation Ξ such that $R = \mathcal{R}(\Xi)$.
2. A relation $R \subseteq S \times S$ is a *state bisimulation* if it is symmetric and for all $a \in L$, $s\ R\ t$ implies $\forall \xi \in \Delta(\Sigma(R)) : T_a(s) \cap \xi \neq \varnothing \iff T_a(t) \cap \xi \neq \varnothing$.
3. A relation R is a *traditional bisimulation* if it is symmetric and for all $a \in L$, $s\ R\ t$ implies that for all $\mu \in T_a(s)$ there exists $\mu' \in T_a(t)$ such that $\mu\ R\ \mu'$.

We say that $s, t \in S$ are traditionally (resp. state-, event-) *bisimilar*, denoted by $s \sim_{\mathrm{t}} t$ ($s \sim_{\mathrm{s}} t$, $s \sim_{\mathrm{e}} t$), if there is a traditional (state, event) bisimulation R such that $s\ R\ t$.

We want to stress the fact that each notion of bisimulation/bisimilarity is defined relative to a particular NLMP. Event bisimulation is a straightforward generalization of the same concept for LMP, and it is the one that is more "compatible" with the measurable structure of the base space. For LMP, it is equivalent to the existence of a cospan of morphisms; see [2]. Traditional bisimulation is in a sense the most faithful generalization of both probabilistic bisimulation by Larsen and Skou and the standard notion of bisimulation for non deterministic processes, e.g., LTS. Finally, state bisimilarity is a good trade-off between the other two, since it is generally finer than event bisimilarity but it is a little more respectful to the measurable structure than the traditional version [4].

Finally, we introduce the logic $\mathscr{L}$ which is given by the productions below. There are two kinds of formulas: one that is interpreted on states, and another that is interpreted on measures.

$$\begin{array}{lcl} \varphi & \equiv & \top \mid \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \mid \langle a \rangle \psi \\ \psi & \equiv & \bigvee_{i \in I} \psi_i \mid \neg \psi \mid [\varphi]_{\geq q} \end{array}$$

where $a \in L$, I is a countable index set, and $q \in \mathbb{Q} \cap [0,1]$. We denote by $\mathscr{L}$ the set of all formulas generated by the first production. Given a NLMP (S, Σ, T), the semantics is the following:

$$\begin{array}{ll} [\![\top]\!] = S & [\![\bigvee_{i \in I} \psi_i]\!] = \bigcup_i [\![\psi_i]\!] \\ [\![\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2]\!] = [\![\varphi_1]\!] \cap [\![\varphi_2]\!] & [\![\neg \psi]\!] = S \setminus [\![\psi]\!] \\ [\![\langle a \rangle \psi]\!] = T_a^{-1}(H_{[\![\psi]\!]}) & [\![[\varphi]_{\geq q}]\!] = \Delta^{\geq q}([\![\varphi]\!]) \end{array}$$

where $[\![\chi]\!]$ denotes the extension of χ. It can be proved by induction that all the sets $[\![\chi]\!]$ are measurable in the respective spaces. Let $[\![\mathscr{L}]\!] \doteq \{[\![\varphi]\!] : \varphi \in \mathscr{L}\}$.

Theorem 4. *The logic $\mathscr{L}$ completely characterizes event bisimulation. In other words, $\mathcal{R}([\![\mathscr{L}]\!]) = \sim_{\mathrm{e}}$.*

Theorem 5. $\sim_{\mathrm{t}} \subseteq \sim_{\mathrm{s}} \subseteq \sim_{\mathrm{e}} = \mathcal{R}([\![\mathscr{L}]\!])$.

Recall that a topological space is *Polish* if it is separable and completely metrizable and an *analytic* space is the image of a continuous map between Polish spaces. The following Lemma summarizes the strategy to prove completeness of a logic for traditional bisimilarity.

Lemma 6. *Let (S, Σ, T) be a NLMP with (S, Σ) being an analytic Borel space. Let $\mathfrak{L}$ be a logic s.t. (i) $\mathfrak{L}$ contains operators $\top$ and $\wedge$ with the usual semantics; (ii) for every formula $\varphi \in \mathfrak{L}$, $[\![\varphi]\!] \in \Sigma$; (iii) the set of all formulas in $\mathfrak{L}$ is countable; and (iv) for every $s\,\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{L})\,t$ and every $\mu \in T_a(s)$ there exists $\mu' \in T_a(t)$ such that $\forall \varphi \in \mathfrak{L}, \mu([\![\varphi]\!]) = \mu'([\![\varphi]\!])$. Then, two logically equivalent states s, t are traditionally bisimilar.*

The proof of this lemma is based on the *unique structure theorem* for analytic Borel spaces (S, Σ): every countably generated sub-σ-algebra of Σ that separates points must already be Σ.

By using this Lemma we were able to prove that a countable fragment of $\mathscr{L}$ was complete for traditional bisimilarity over image-finite NLMP. The next step would be to prove a similar result for image-countable processes, and the safest way to test this is in a more "discrete" setting. In the next section we consider a restricted class of processes.

2.2 Measurable LTS

Many interesting (counter)examples can be constructed by considering non-probabilistic NLMP, i.e., one $\mathbf{S} = (S, \Sigma, \{T_a : a \in L\})$ such that for all $a \in L$ and $s \in S$, $T_a(s)$ consists entirely of point-masses (i.e., Dirac measures). In this section, we will give a slightly simpler presentation of this kind of processes, that appears in Wolovick [14]. Actually, these processes are essentially a labelled transition system (LTS) over a measurable space.

Definition 7. A *measurable labelled transition system* (MLTS) is a tuple $\mathbf{S} = (S, \Sigma, \{T_a : a \in L\})$ such that (S, Σ) is a measurable space and for each label $a \in L$, $T_a : (S, \Sigma) \to (\Sigma, H(\Sigma))$ is a measurable map.

If we write $\langle a \rangle Q$ ($\Diamond Q$ in case L is a singleton) for $\{s : T_a(s) \cap Q \neq \varnothing\}$, then the previous requirement on T_a amounts to asking Σ to be *stable* under the map $\langle a \rangle$: for all $Q \in \Sigma$, $\langle a \rangle Q \in \Sigma$. This observation can be generalized to event bisimulations. The following lemma appears in [4].

Lemma 8.

1. *A σ-algebra $\Lambda \subseteq \Sigma$ is an event bisimulation on $\mathbf{S}$ if and only if it is stable under the mapping $\langle a \rangle$.*
2. *A symmetric relation R is a state bisimulation on $\mathbf{S}$ if and only if for all $s, t \in S$ such that $s\,R\,t$, it holds that for all $Q \in \Sigma(R)$, $s \in \langle a \rangle Q \Leftrightarrow t \in \langle a \rangle Q$.*

3. A symmetric relation R is a traditional bisimulation on $\mathbf{S}$ if and only if for all $s, t \in S$ and $u \in T_a(s)$, if $s \, R \, t$ then there exists $v \in T_a(t)$ such that $u \, \mathcal{R}\,(\Sigma(R)) \, v$.

Since for every relation one has $R \subseteq \mathcal{R}\,(\Sigma(R))$, standard bisimilarity for LTS is also a traditional bisimulation of MLTS. Observe also that the logic $\mathscr{L}$ is the same as Hennessy-Milner logic with countable conjunctions (and disjunctions) on this family of processes, and hence it characterizes standard bisimulation for image-countable MLTS. By appealing to Theorem 5 we can state

Proposition 9. *For image-countable MLTS, all kinds of bisimilarities (traditional, state, event and standard) coincide.*

We shall henceforth drop the subindexes and use simply $\sim$.

Let's return to the problem left open at the end of the previous section. To apply Lemma 6, the candidate logic should satisfy several requirements. So the first question is if there actually exists any countable logic that characterizes bisimilarity for countable LTS. The answer is given by the following

Example 10 (X. Caicedo)**.** There are at most $2^{\aleph_0}$ (bisimilarity classes of) countable LTS over $\mathbb{N}$. Hence there is an injective function f from bisimilarity classes to $\mathsf{Pow}(\mathbb{N})$. Our 'logic' will consist of countably many atomic formulas P_n ($n \in \mathbb{N}$) with the following semantics:

$$\mathbf{S}, s \models P_n \iff n \in f([(\mathbf{S}, s)]_\sim),$$

where $[\cdot]_\sim$ denotes $\sim$-classes of equivalence. The logic $\mathscr{L}_X := \{P_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is sound and complete for bisimilarity.

The logic $\mathscr{L}_X$ is devised in a non-constructive manner, and the main result in this work is to show that actually the extensions of formulas of such a countable logic cannot be Borel sets, confirming the intuition that formulas in $\mathscr{L}_X$ cannot be conceived as any reasonable kind of "test" on a process.

3 The main result

We will use some concepts from sequence (zero-dimensional) spaces. The set of all finite sequences of natural numbers will be denoted by $\mathbb{N}^*$. The empty sequence will be denoted by ϵ. The ith element of a sequence $s \in \mathbb{N}^*$ will be denoted by s^i; hence $s = (s^0, \dots, s^{|s|-1})$, where $|s|$ is the length of s. The sequence $s^\frown n$, where $s \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is the result of appending n at the end of s: $s^\frown n = (s^0, \dots, s^{|s|-1}, n)$.

Let A be countable, and consider the discrete topology on it. The product space $A^{\mathbb{N}}$ of all infinite sequences of elements of A is Polish and has a (clopen) basis given by the sets $C_f = \{x \in A^{\mathbb{N}} : f \subset x\}$, where f a finite function. When $A = 2$, we obtain the Cantor space $\mathsf{Pow}(\mathbb{N})$. In general, for every countable set B, we regard $\mathsf{Pow}(B)$ as a compact Hausdorff space with basic open sets $\{X \subseteq B : P \subseteq X \;\&\; N \cap X = \varnothing\}$, where $P, N \subseteq B$ are finite. In case $B = \mathbb{N}$ we obtain exactly the basis given by $\{C_f\}$.

A binary structure $(\mathbb{N}, R)$ can be represented by a point in $\mathrm{Rel} \doteq 2^{\mathbb{N}\times\mathbb{N}}$. The set LO of strict linear orders is closed in Rel and hence a Polish space. A *tree* on $\mathbb{N}$ is a subset of $\mathbb{N}^*$ closed by taking prefixes. The set $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{N}}$ of all trees on $\mathbb{N}$ is a closed subset in $2^{\mathbb{N}^*}$.

We will also use the standard notation for classes of pointsets arising in descriptive set theory; namely, $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_1(X)$ ($\mathbf{\Pi}^0_1(X)$) are the open (closed) sets of a topological space X, $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\alpha(X)$ ($\mathbf{\Pi}^0_\alpha(X)$) are countable unions (intersections) of sets in $\mathbf{\Pi}^0_\beta(X)$ ($\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\beta(X)$) with $\beta < \alpha$. Then the family of Borel subsets of X is $\mathcal{B}(X) \doteq \bigcup_{\alpha<\omega_1} \mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\alpha(X) = \bigcup_{\alpha<\omega_1} \mathbf{\Pi}^0_\alpha(X)$. $\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_1(X)$ denotes the family of analytic subsets of X (see [10]). All these classes are preserved by taking continuous preimages and finite unions and intersections. We will usually omit the reference to the space X.

3.1 Bisimilarity is not Borel

We first recall a standard construction of trees from linear orders. Given a strict linear order $(\mathbb{N}, R)$ we may define a new countable structure $(T_R, \triangleleft)$ with $\triangleleft \in 2^{\mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N}^*}$ as follows:

- $T_R \doteq \{s \in \mathbb{N}^* : s^{|s|-1} \mathrel{R} s^{|s|-2} \mathrel{R} \dots \mathrel{R} s^0\} \cup \{\epsilon\}$.
- $s \triangleleft s' \iff \exists n \in \mathbb{N} : s^\frown n = s'$.

The tree T_R consists of all finite decreasing sequences in $(\mathbb{N}, R)$.

Lemma 11. *The map $R \mapsto T_R$ from LO to $2^{\mathbb{N}^*}$ is continuous.*

Proof. We will show that the function from $2^{\mathbb{N}\times\mathbb{N}}$ to $2^{\mathbb{N}^*}$ with the same definition is continuous. Assume $s_1, \dots, s_n, t_1, \dots, t_m \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Then

$$\left.\begin{array}{c} s_1, \dots s_n \in T_R \\ t_1, \dots t_m \notin T_R, \end{array}\right] \iff \left[\begin{array}{l} \forall i < n, \forall j : 0 < j < |s_i| \Rightarrow s_i^j \mathrel{R} s_i^{j-1} \\ \forall i < m, \exists j : 0 < j < |t_i| \mathbin{\&} t_i^j \not\mathrel{R} t_i^{j-1}. \end{array}\right.$$

The last condition involve finite intersections and unions of clopen sets, and hence it is open. For a little more detail, let $P = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$, $N = \{t_1, \dots, t_m\}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} &(T_\bullet)^{-1}(\{T \subseteq \mathbb{N}^* : P \subseteq T \mathbin{\&} N \cap T = \varnothing\}) = \\ &\qquad = \{R \subseteq \mathbb{N}\times\mathbb{N} : U \subseteq R\} \cap \bigcap_{i<m} \bigcup_{0<j<|t_i|} \{R \subseteq \mathbb{N}\times\mathbb{N} : V_{i,j} \cap R = \varnothing\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $U = \{(s_i^j, s_i^{j-1}) : i < n,\ 0 < j < |s_i|\}$ and $V_{i,j} = \{(t_i^j, t_i^{j-1})\}$. ☐

The main idea is that we can distinguish wellorders $(\mathbb{N}, R)$ just by checking the bisimilarity type of $(T_R, \triangleleft, \epsilon)$. Also, we can tell apart wellorders from non well founded relations.

Define by recursion on $\alpha < \omega_1$ the following modal formulas:

- $\varphi_0 \doteq \top$.
- $\varphi_{\alpha+1} \doteq \Diamond\varphi_\alpha$.
- $\varphi_\lambda \doteq \bigwedge_{\beta<\lambda} \varphi_\beta$, for limit λ.

Proposition 12. *For a wellorder $(\mathbb{N}, R)$ of type α, $T_R, \epsilon \models \varphi_\beta$ if and only if $\beta \leq \alpha$. If $(\mathbb{N}, R)$ is not well founded, $T_R, \epsilon \models \varphi_\beta$ for all $\beta < \omega_1$.*

Corollary 13. *If* $(\mathbb{N}, R)$ *is a wellorder and* $R' \in LO$*,* $T_R, \epsilon \sim T_{R'}, \epsilon \iff (\mathbb{N}, R) \cong (\mathbb{N}, R')$*.*

It is well-known (J. Stern [13]) see that the class $WO^{<\alpha}$ of wellorders of type less than $\alpha < \omega_1$ has arbitrary large Borel complexity with α big enough. We will use this fact and the previous lemmas to prove that bisimilarity is not Borel. But first we must merge the tree processes T_R into a single MLTS.

Let $\mathbf{F} = (F, \mathcal{B}(F), \bar{\lhd})$, where:

- $(F, \mathcal{B}(F)) \doteq (\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{N}^*, \mathcal{B}(\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{N}^*))$ (where $\mathbb{N}^*$ is considered discrete).
- $\bar{\lhd}(T, s) = \{(T, s') : s, s' \in T \;\&\; s \lhd s'\}$.

We prove that $\mathbf{F}$ is a MLTS. First note that sets $\bar{\lhd}((T, s))$, being countable, are Borel. We will also use the symbol $\bar{\lhd}$ also as a binary relation, defined in the obvious way: $(T, s) \mathrel{\bar{\lhd}} (T', s')$ iff $T = T'$, $s, s' \in T$ and $s \lhd s'$.

For subset $A \subseteq X \times Y$ of a product and $c \in Y$ the *section* $A|_c$ is the set $\{x \in X : (x, c) \in A\}$, the preimage of the injection $x \mapsto (x, c)$.

Lemma 14. $\Diamond Q$ *is Borel for each* $Q \in \mathcal{B}(\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{N}^*)$*.*

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Diamond Q &= \{(T, s) \in F : \exists (T', s') \in Q \; ((T, s) \mathrel{\bar{\lhd}} (T', s'))\} \\
&= \{(T, s) \in F : \exists s' \; ((T, s') \in Q \;\&\; (T, s) \mathrel{\bar{\lhd}} (T, s'))\} \\
&= \{(T, s) \in F : \exists n \in \mathbb{N} (s^\frown n \in T \;\&\; (T, s^\frown n) \in Q)\} \\
&= \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{s \in \mathbb{N}^*} \{(T, s) \in F : s^\frown n \in T \;\&\; (T, s^\frown n) \in Q\}
\end{aligned}$$

Now we may write the set inside the unions (now for fixed s, n) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\{(T, s) \in F : s^\frown n \in T \;\&\; (T, s^\frown n) \in Q\} &= \Big(Q \cap \{(T, s^\frown n) : s^\frown n \in T\}\Big)|_{s^\frown n} \times \{s\} \\
&= \Big(Q \cap \big(\{T : s^\frown n \in T\} \times \{s^\frown n\}\big)\Big)|_{s^\frown n} \times \{s\}
\end{aligned}$$

The inner rectangle is clopen, and since Q is Borel, the set between the big parentheses is Borel. The whole set is easily Borel, too. ☐

Theorem 15. $\sim$ *is not a Borel subset of* $F \times F$*.*

Proof. It is clear that the injection $T \mapsto (T, \epsilon)$ is continuous from $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{N}}$ to $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{N}^*$; hence the composition $R \to \bar{T}_R = (T_R, \epsilon)$ also is (by Lemma 11). If $\sim$ were $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\xi$, then $[\bar{T}_R]_\sim = (\sim)|_{\bar{T}_R}$ would also be for every R. For R a wellorder of type α, $WO^\alpha = (\bar{T}_\bullet)^{-1}([\bar{T}_R]_\sim)$ by Corollary 13. This implies that $WO^{<\alpha} = \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} WO^{<\alpha}$ would be $\mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\xi$ for all $\alpha < \omega_1$, contradicting the results in [13]. ☐

Lemma 16. *If* $\mathscr{L}$ *is a countable logic that characterizes bisimulation and* $[\![\mathscr{L}]\!] \subseteq \mathcal{B}(F)$*, then there exists* $\alpha < \omega_1$ *such that for all* s*,* $[s]_\sim$ *is* $\mathbf{\Pi}^0_\alpha(F)$*.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{R}(\llbracket \mathscr{L} \rrbracket) = \sim$,

$$[s]_\sim = \bigcap \{\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket : F, s \models \varphi\} \cap \bigcap \{F \setminus \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket : F, s \not\models \varphi\}. \tag{1}$$

Take $\beta = \sup\{\gamma < \omega_1 : \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket \notin \mathbf{\Sigma}^0_\gamma, \varphi \in \mathscr{L}\}$. Now, for all $\varphi \in \mathscr{L}$, $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket \in \mathbf{\Sigma}^0_{\beta+1}$, $F \setminus \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket \in \mathbf{\Pi}^0_{\beta+1}$, and countable intersections of such sets lie in $\mathbf{\Pi}^0_{\beta+2}$. Hence for $\alpha = \beta + 2$, all sets in (1) lie in $\mathbf{\Pi}^0_\alpha$. ☐

By combining the proof of Theorem 15 and the previous Lemma we obtain

Theorem 17. *There is no countable logic $\mathscr{L}$ that characterizes bisimulation on* $\mathbf{F}$ *such that* $\llbracket \mathscr{L} \rrbracket \subseteq \mathcal{B}(F)$.

3.2 Bisimilarity is $\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_1$

We finally show in this section that bisimilarity on $\mathbf{F}$ behaves similarly to the isomorphism relation: it is an analytic equivalence relation with Borel classes.

We will need a technical tool from Janin and Walukiewicz [9], adapted to our mono-modal case. An *ω-indexed path from $s \in S$* on a LTS $\mathbf{S} = (S, R)$ is a sequence u of the form

$$u = s_0(s_1, a_1)(s_2, a_2) \dots (s_n, a_n)$$

such that $s_0 = s$, $a_i \in \mathbb{N}$ for all i, and $(s_{i-1}, s_i) \in R$ for $i = 0, \dots, n$. The *ω-expansion at s* of a LTS $\mathbf{S}$ is the LTS $\bar{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{\mathbf{S}}(s) = (\bar{\Omega}, \bar{R})$ such that $\bar{\Omega}$ is the set of all ω-indexed paths from s of $\mathbf{S}$ and the relation $\bar{R}$ is defined by $(u, v) \in \bar{R}$ iff v has the form $u(s, a)$ for some a and s.

Since we are dealing with trees on $\mathbb{N}$, the latter construction provides us with another tree that it is easily seen to be isomorphic to the one given by the following alternative description.

Definition 18. The *ω-expansion of* $\mathbf{T} = (T, \triangleleft)$ *at s* is the LTS $\mathbf{\Omega}_{\mathbf{T}}(s) = (\Omega_{\mathbf{T}}(s), R_{\mathbf{T}}(s))$ such that $\Omega_{\mathbf{T}}(s) = \{(t, n) : s \subseteq t \in T \ \& \ n \in \omega\}$ and the relation $R_{\mathbf{T}}(s) \subseteq (T \times \mathbb{N})^2$ is given by

$$(u, n) \ R_{\mathbf{T}}(s) \ (t, m) \iff u \triangleleft t.$$

If $\mathbf{T}$ is understood from the context will just write $\mathbf{\Omega}(s) = (\Omega(s), R(s))$.

It can be proved that two states in a tree are bisimilar if and only if have isomorphic ω-expansions.

Lemma 19. *Bisimilarity classes on* $\mathbf{F}$ *are Borel.*

Proof. By the previous observation we conclude that $[(T, s)]_\sim = R^{-1}([R((T, s))]_\cong)$. By Scott's Theorem [12], we know that $[R((T, s))]_\cong$ is a Borel subset of $2^{(\mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N})^2}$. Then we just have to show that the map $R(\cdot) : \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{N}^* \to 2^{(\mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N})^2}$ given by

$$(u, n) \ R((T, s)) \ (t, m) \iff s \subseteq u \ \& \ u \triangleleft t \ \& \ t \in T$$

is Borel measurable.

For a finite set $P = \{((u_i, n_i), (t_i, m_i)) : i = 1, \dots, k\}$ of elements of $(\mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N})^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R^{-1}(\{R : P \subseteq R\}) &= \{(T, s) : t_i \in T \ \&\ s \subseteq u_i \ i = 1, \dots, k\} \\ &= \{T : \forall i \ (t_i \in T)\} \times \{s : \forall i \ (s \subseteq u_i)\}, \end{aligned}$$

if $\forall i : u_i \lhd t_i$, and it is empty otherwise.

This proves that the map is continuous and, *a fortiori*, Borel measurable. ☐

By using the previous reduction, one can prove that bisimilarity is $\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_1$, since isomorphism is. We also give a direct proof of this fact.

Lemma 20. *Let A be countable with the discrete topology, Y Polish and $B_k \subseteq Y$ Borel for all $k \in A$. Then*

$$C(R, y) \overset{\bullet}{\iff} \forall k \in R : (y \in B_k)$$

is Borel in $2^A \times Y$.

Proof. We have $(R, y) \in C \iff \forall k \in A : (k \in R \Rightarrow y \in B_k)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} C &= \bigcap_{k \in A} \{(R, y) : k \in R \Rightarrow y \in B_k\} \\ &= \bigcap_{k \in A} \{(R, y) : k \notin R\} \cup \{(R, y) : y \in B_k\} \\ &= \bigcap_{k \in A} (\{R : k \notin R\} \times Y) \cup (2^A \times \{y : y \in B_k\}) \\ &= \bigcap_{k \in A} (\{R : \{k\} \cap R = \varnothing\} \times Y) \cup (2^A \times B_k) \end{aligned}$$

which is obviously Borel. ☐

Theorem 21. *Bisimilarity on $\mathbf{F}$ is $\mathbf{\Sigma}^1_1$.*

Proof. As usual, n, m denote non negative integers and s_i finite sequences. The definition of bisimilarity on $\mathbf{F}$ is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (T_1, s) \sim (T_2, s') \iff & \exists R \in 2^{\mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N}^*} : (s, s') \in R \ \& \\ & \& \ \forall s_1 \forall s_2 \forall n. \Big(s_1{}^\frown n \in T_1 \ \&\ s_2 \in T_2 \ \&\ (s_1, s_2) \in R \implies \\ & \qquad \exists m : s_2{}^\frown m \in T_2 \ \&\ (s_1{}^\frown n, s_2{}^\frown m) \in R \Big) \ \& \\ & \& \ \forall s_1 \forall s_2 \forall n. \Big(s_1 \in T_1 \ \&\ s_2{}^\frown n \in T_2 \ \&\ (s_1, s_2) \in R \implies \\ & \qquad \exists m : s_1{}^\frown m \in T_1 \ \&\ (s_1{}^\frown m, s_2{}^\frown n) \in R \Big). \end{aligned}$$

It suffices to prove that the set defined inside the outer existential quantifier is Borel in $2^{\mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{N}^*} \times F \times F$. We first consider the third line of the definition. The set defined by

$$(R, (T_1, s), (T_2, s')) \in X_{(s_1, s_2), n, m} \overset{\bullet}{\iff} s_2{}^\frown m \in T_2 \ \&\ (s_1{}^\frown n, s_2{}^\frown m) \in R$$

is easily Borel. Then the condition $\exists m : s_2{}^\frown m \in T_2 \;\&\; (s_1{}^\frown n, s_2{}^\frown m) \in R$ also is and

$$\forall n.\Big(s_1{}^\frown n \in T_1 \;\&\; s_2 \in T_2 \implies \exists m : s_2{}^\frown m \in T_2 \;\&\; (s_1{}^\frown n, s_2{}^\frown m) \in R\Big)$$

finally defines a Borel set of tuples $(R, (T_1, s), (T_2, s'))$ indexed by elements $(s_1, s_2) \in R$. We may apply now Lemma 20 and conclude that

$$\forall (s_1, s_2) \in R : \forall n.\Big(s_1{}^\frown n \in T_1 \;\&\; s_2 \in T_2 \implies \exists m : s_2{}^\frown m \in T_2 \;\&\; (s_1{}^\frown n, s_2{}^\frown m) \in R\Big),$$

which is equivalent to the second and third lines of our definition for bisimilarity, is Borel.

The rest of the formula is handled similarly. □

4 Conclusion

In the framework of nondeterministic labelled Markov process, we considered the problem of describing bisimilarity by using a modal logic. We studied this problem in a very restricted case, that of image-countable processes where the only kind of probabilities considered are Dirac measures.

In this restricted setting, all proposed definitions of bisimilarity coincide (in particular with the standard bisimilarity notion for labelled transition systems). We proved that the relation of bisimilarity is a analytic non Borel subset of F^2, where F is the base space of a model consisting of trees, and hence there is no countable Borel logic that characterizes bisimilarity for this process.

Indeed, Hennessy-Milner logic already characterizes bisimilarity in this case, and it is a Borel logic (obviously with uncountable many formulas). But in order to cope with image-countable NLMP with no restrictions on the kind of probabilities we use, this is a serious limitation: to our knowledge, all the proofs for logical characterization of bisimilarities are based on the structure of analytic spaces, and evidence shows that one needs a countable Borel logic to be able to use this structural properties.

Acknowlegdements. I want to thank Prof. Xavier Caicedo for a nice discussion concerning modal logics and for his Example 10. I would also like to thank José Mijares for some comments on descriptive-set-theoretical issues.

References

[1] P. Celayes, "Procesos de Markov Etiquetados sobre Espacios de Borel Estándar", Master's thesis, FaMAF, Universidad Nacional de Córdoba (2006).

[2] V. Danos, J. Desharnais, F. Laviolette, P. Panangaden, Bisimulation and cocongruence for probabilistic systems, *Inf. Comput.* **204**: 503–523 (2006).

[3] P. D'Argenio, N. Wolovick, P. Sánchez Terraf, P. Celayes, Nondeterministic labeled Markov processes: Bisimulations and logical characterization, in: QEST, IEEE Computer Society: 11–20 (2009).

[4] P.R. D'Argenio, P. Sánchez Terraf, N. Wolovick, Bisimulations for nondeterministic labelled Markov processes, *Mathematical. Structures in Comp. Sci.* **22**: 43–68 (2012).

[5] J. Desharnais, "Labeled Markov Process", Ph.D. thesis, McGill University (1999).

[6] J. Desharnais, A. Edalat, P. Panangaden, Bisimulation for labelled Markov processes, *Inf. Comput.* **179**: 163–193 (2002).

[7] J. Desharnais, F. Laviolette, A. Turgeon, A logical duality for underspecified probabilistic systems, *Inf. Comput.* **209**: 850–871 (2011).

[8] E.E. Doberkat, Semi-pullbacks and bisimulations in categories of stochastic relations, in: ICALP'03: Proceedings of the 30th international conference on Automata, languages and programming, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg: 996–1007 (2003).

[9] D. Janin, I. Walukiewicz, On the expressive completeness of the propositional mu-calculus with respect to monadic second order logic, in: U. Montanari, V. Sassone (Eds.), CONCUR, Lecture Notes in Computer Science **1119**, Springer: 263–277 (1996).

[10] A.S. Kechris, "Classical Descriptive Set Theory", Graduate Texts in Mathematics **156**, Springer-Verlag (1994).

[11] K.G. Larsen, A. Skou, Bisimulation through probabilistic testing, *Inf. Comput.* **94**: 1–28 (1991).

[12] D. Scott, Invariant Borel sets, *Fund. Math.* **56**: 117–128 (1964).

[13] J. Stern, Évaluation du rang de Borel de certains ensembles, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* **286**: A855–857 (1978).

[14] N. Wolovick, "Continuous Probability and Nondeterminism in Labeled Transition Systems", Ph.D. thesis, Universidad Nacional de Córdoba (2012).

CIEM — Facultad de Matemática, Astronomía y Física (Fa.M.A.F.)
Universidad Nacional de Córdoba — Ciudad Universitaria
Córdoba 5000. Argentina.

and

Algebraische und Logische Grundlagen der Informatik
Institut für Theoretische Informatik
Technische Universität Dresden — Fakultät Informatik
01062 Dresden